Case 2:08-cr. 00020-BMM Document 143-2, Filed 06/01/21 Page 1 of 2

FCI TERMINAL ISLAND

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

P.O. BOX 3007

SAN PEDRO, CA 90733

Clerk, U.S. Courts District of Montana Missoula Division

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTAN A

BUTTE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CASE: CR 08-24-BU-BMM

Plaintiff,

MOTION TO CLARIFY REPLY

CHARLES B. PARKE, Judge: HA. BRIAN MORRIS

DEFENDANT: (CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE)

IN my REPly MEMO, from pages 59-18 I day discuss and argue as both an "extraodinary" reason and part of \$3533(a) consideration, the legally untermable 54B1.1 "career oftender" educement in my case. I point out my possible \$2241 claim based on the Anth Circuit's decision in allen v. Ives, 950 F.3d 1184 (9th Cr. 2020). But, I've since discovered a district court decision (Jaramillo v. United States, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83075, (D. ARROMA, May 11, 2020) which directly disputes my ability to raise an "actual innoverse" defense to a \$4131.1 enhancement after United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005) - Meaning since I

was sentenced after Booker.

Therefore, I would like to clarify that my pending motion for compossionate release may be the only available avenue for a court to consider this issue. Thus, to the fullest extent possible in light of United States v. Bautista, CNo. 19-10448) (9th Cir., Dec. 11, 2020) and other authority ested in my Reply (showing the district court has broad discretion to consider any extraordinary and compelling reasons, decoupled from USSG \$181.13) I am regresting that this court consider - in total-the career-offender arguments I've put forth and in all newsory respects decide the arguments raised in Eggly to the government's renewed claim in its opposition that the \$ 981.1 exhancement was and is "still" valid.

Respectfully submitted: May 20, 2021.

Sincerely,

Charles B. Parke (# 10211-046)
Defendant, pro SC